

Mark Petting et al.
Application No.: 09/784,274
Page 10

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. P019

REMARKS

Status of Application

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 28 has been amended to more particularly describe the invention.

No new matter has been introduced. Applicants believe the claims to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stracovsky et al ("Stracovsky") in view of Joffe. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as presented in the application recites "storing a first portion of the write data burst in a buffer, concurrently with activating the at least one memory unit to receive data, if the at least one memory unit is not available to receive data; writing a second portion of the write data burst to the at least one memory unit when the at least one memory unit is available to receive data; and writing the first portion of the write data burst from the buffer to the at least one memory unit after writing the second portion of the write data burst." Claims 9, 17, 20, 24 and 28 similarly recite limitations wherein the first portion of a write data burst is written from a buffer to a memory unit after a second portion of the write data burst is written to the memory unit. In no manner do Stracovsky or Joffe, taken either each alone or in combination, teach or suggest writing the first portion of a write data burst from a buffer to a memory unit after having previously written to the memory unit a second portion of the write data burst.

Mark Petting et al.
Application No.: 09/784,274
Page 11

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. P019

The Examiner correctly states that Stracovsky fails to teach writing the first portion of a write data burst from a buffer to a memory unit after having previously written to the memory unit a second portion of the write data burst. Moreover, the Examiner correctly cites Joffe as teaching a buffer able to both store subsets of bits for every data word burst and transfer each subset in parallel to a memory in consecutive clock cycles. As such, Joffe fails to teach the serial transfer of data burst portions to memory as is required by Applicants' claim 1.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that neither Stracovsky nor Joffe, taken either each alone or in combination, shows, teaches or makes obvious Applicants' novel invention as set forth in claims 1, 9, 17, 20, 24 and 28.

Applicants' claim 2-8 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, contain all the limitations disclosed in claim 1. Thus, Applicants' claim 2-8 utilize the same novel combination taught in claim 1. Further, Applicants' claim 10-16 depend from claim 9 and, therefore, contain all the limitations disclosed in claim 9. Thus, Applicants' claim 10-16 utilize the same novel combination taught in claim 9. Further, Applicants' claim 18-19 depend from claim 17 and, therefore, contain all the limitations disclosed in claim 17. Thus, Applicants' claim 18-19 utilize the same novel combination taught in claim 17. Further, Applicants' claim 21-23 depend from claim 20 and, therefore, contain all the limitations disclosed in claim 20. Thus, Applicants' claim 21-23 utilize the same novel combination taught in claim 17. Further, Applicants' claim 25-27 depend from claim 24 and, therefore, contain all the limitations disclosed in claim 24. Thus, Applicants' claim 25-27 utilize the same novel combination taught in claim 24. Further, Applicants' claim 29-31 depend from claim 28 and, therefore, contain all the limitations disclosed in claim 28. Thus, Applicants' claim 29-31 utilize the same novel combination taught in claim 28. Accordingly, in view of the distinctions between the teachings of Stracovsky and Joffe and the novel combination set forth in Applicants' claim 2-8, 10-16, 18-19, 21-23, 25-27 and 29-31, and for at least the reasons discussed above in conjunction with claims 1, 9, 17, 20, 24 and 28, neither Stracovsky nor Joffe, taken either each alone or in

Mark Petting et al.
Application No.: 09/784,274
Page 12

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. P019

combination, shows, teaches or makes obvious Applicants' novel invention as set forth in claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-19, 21-23, 25-27 and 29-31.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 425-896-6245.

Respectfully submitted,



P. G. Scott Born
Reg. No. 40,523

Date: December 2, 2003

8815 - 122nd Avenue NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
(425) 896-6164 (direct)
(425) 896-6063 (fax)